

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-79 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4, 13-29, 32, 34-38, 40-44, 46, 49, 60, 69, 71, 73, and 76-79 have been amended. Claim 80 has been added.

**I. Formalities**

In the Office Action Summary Sheet (PTOL-326), the Examiner failed to indicated whether the drawings filed on January 9, 2004 were accepted or objected to. However, as the Examiner has not made any objection in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner indicated that the drawings filed January 9, 2004 have been accepted in the next Office Action.

**II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Peled et al., (US Pat. Appl. 2005/0288939). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

configuring a policy, said policy including a policy element, said policy applicable to a plurality of interface document types; wherein said policy element comprises a conformance rule which defines a standard which interface documents of said plurality of interface document types to which the policy is applicable should conform

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the “policy” of Peled teaches or suggests the claimed policy. In particular, the Examiner cited the policies described in paragraph [0095] of Peled. According to paragraph [0170] of Peled, the policies referred to therein “comprise[] one or more rules, which determine the limitations and restrictions with respect to usage and distribution of the [ ] information object” to which it is applicable. However, Applicant

respectfully submits that such a policy clearly does not comprise “a conformance rule which defines a **standard** which **interface documents** of said plurality of interface document types to which the policy is applicable **should conform.**” In other words, the policy of Peled is directed to usage and distribution of a document and is not at all concerned with standards to which the document should conform. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Peled fails to teach or suggest at least this requirement of the claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Peled, because the reference does not disclose all of the features and limitations of the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-25 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Further, Applicant submits that independent claims 26, 38, 41, 46, 49, 60, 69, 71, 73, 76 and 78 and their dependant claims 27-37, 39-40, 42-45, 47-48, 50-59, 61-68, 70, 72, 74-75, 77 and 79 are also patentable over Peled for at least the same or similar reasons. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 26, 38, 41, 46, 49, 60, 69, 71, 73, 76 and 78 and dependant claims 27-37, 39-40, 42-45, 47-48, 50-59, 61-68, 70, 72, 74-75, 77 and 79.

### **III. New Claim**

New claim 80 has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that this new claim is patentable over the prior art for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

**IV Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Logan J. Brown 58,290/  
Logan J. Brown  
Registration No. 58,290

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 22, 2008